

**REMARKS**

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's restriction requirement, and his indication of Applicants' constructive election of Group I, claims 1-8, 13, and 17-31. The Examiner has correspondingly withdrawn Group II, claims 9-12, 14-16 and 32 from consideration.

Applicants formally elect Group I, with traverse, as the Examiner's basis for restriction is not understood. For example, Applicants note that the Examiner has already examined the features recited in withdrawn independent claim 12 (corresponding to original independent claim 1 rewritten to include the features of original dependent claim 2) and dependent claims 14-16 (corresponding to original claims 9-11 rewritten according to the Examiner's suggestion), and has previously indicated that these claims are all allowable. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that it cannot reasonably be considered to be a serious or undue burden on the Examiner to continue to examine claims 12 and 14-16, as the Examiner has already performed a search for the features recited in these claims, and has found these claims allowable.

In any event, Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional Application directed to the non-elected claims.

**Status of the Application**

Claims 1-40 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 33-40 are hereby added. Claims 1-8, 13, and 17-31 have been rejected. Claims 9-12, 14-16 and 32 are currently withdrawn from consideration.

**Obviousness Rejection**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 13 and 17-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kashiwazaki* (US 6,459,497 B1; hereinafter “*Kashiwazaki*”) in view of *Mitsuhashi* (US 6,320,667 B1; hereinafter “*Mitsuhashi*”) and *Tang et al.* (US 6,160,629; hereinafter “*Tang*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

**Independent Claims 1 and 7**

The Examiner takes the position that *Kashiwazaki* discloses most of the features of claims 1 and 7, except that it fails to teach or suggest that “the computer comprises a logical printer driver for making print instructions of a prepared document and preparing a PDL document and print information from the document, and spooling as a print job wherein the print information comprises storage data indicating whether the print job is to be archived in a printer and storage format data indicating in what format the print job should be archived” (Office Action, pg. 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> full par.). Applicants agree that *Kashiwazaki* fails to teach or suggest these features.

Nevertheless, the Examiner applies: (1) *Mitsuhashi*, taking the position that it discloses “a logical printer driver (203 in fig. 4A) for making print instructions of a prepared document;” and (2) *Tang*, taking the position that it discloses that “print information comprises storage data indicating whether the print job is to be archived in a printer and storage format data indicating in what format the print job should be archived” (citing FIG. 4C and col. 4, lines 48-50).

However, even if it were possible to modify *Kashiwazaki* in view of *Mitsuhashi* and *Tang* as the Examiner has alleged, Applicants respectfully submit that none of these references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teaches or suggests *at least* “a logical printer driver for

making print instructions of a prepared document,” where “the print information comprises storage data indicating whether the print job is to be archived in a printer and storage format data indicating in what format the print job should be archived.”

Specifically, *Kashiwazaki* and *Mitsuhashi* fail to teach or suggest any archiving of print jobs, as the Examiner has conceded. Further, *Tang* simply discloses a personal computer 12 and printer 10 system where print jobs generated by the printer driver 18 are stored for later use on disk drive 30 in printer 10. In the portion cited by the Examiner, *Tang* discloses that the print job can be stored as “a data file before it is rendered to a rasterized image file, or, preferably, as a rasterized image file” (col. 4, lines 26-52).

Thus, *Tang* discloses alternative embodiments of file storage such that the system would either be designed to store files as a “data file” or a “rasterized image.” There is simply no teaching or suggestion that a user would have any choice as to store a file in one or the other of these formats, or that *Tang*’s system is capable of discerning whether it should store the print jobs as a “data file” or a “rasterized image.” Thus, there would be no need for “storage format data” to be included with the “print information,” as recited in claims 1 and 7.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 are patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 30 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 30 are separately patentable over the applied references.

For example, regarding claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest that “the computer further comprises a print instruction section for updating the print information of the print job and making print instructions.”

Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion in any of the applied references that it is possible to “update” print information of the print job. As the Examiner concedes, *Kashiwazaki* and *Mitsuhashi* only disclose real-time printing of print jobs, thus making impossible any updating of print information. Further, even if the requesting of additional copies at *Tang*’s printer could be considered “updating” a print job, as the Examiner alleges, this request comes from a user at the printer, not from a “print instruction section” that is part of the “computer,” as recited in claim 2.

Additionally, regarding claims 3 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest storing “a pair of PDL document and printer information and a pair of dot image and print information as the print job.”

Specifically, as mentioned above, *Tang* only discloses the storage of a “data file” or a “rasterized image file.” There is simply no teaching or suggestion that *Tang* is at all capable of storing both a PDL document and a dot image, along with their respective print information.

Further, regarding claims 22 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest that “the print information of the print job stored in the archive can be updated by the computer.”

Specifically, as discussed above with respect to claim 2, even if the requesting of additional copies at a printer in *Tang* could be considered “updating” a print job, this request comes from a user at the printer, and therefore is not “updated by the computer.”

Independent Claim 4

The Examiner has not specifically indicated where he believes the features of independent claim 4 are taught or suggested in the prior art. Instead, he has merely indicated that “due to the similarities of” claim 4 to claims 1 and 3, claim 4 “is rejected as the reasons from” claims 1 and 3 (Office Action, pg. 8).

Thus, as an initial matter, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met his burden of establishing *prima facie* obviousness, as he has not rejected each of the features of independent claim 4 with any specificity.

Nevertheless, in an attempt to speed prosecution, Applicants respectfully submit that even a combination of *Kashiwazaki*, *Mitsuhashi* and *Tang* (which the Examiner has alleged discloses all the features of claims 1 and 3) fails to teach or suggest *at least* “an output control section controlling storage of the dot image stored in the output work and the print information in the archive as the print job.”

Specifically, there is simply no teaching or suggestion that frame memory 104 of *Kashiwazaki*, the feature alleged by the Examiner to correspond to the recited “output work,” is at all capable of “controlling” any storage in an archive. Rather, frame memory 104 simply holds a one page bitmap image for use by printer-unit interface 16 (col. 8, lines 8-12). *Mitsuhashi* is also silent on such features.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that *Tang* also fails to provide these features, as there is no particular teaching or suggestion of any feature that remotely corresponds to the frame memory 104, or that would allow frame memory 104 to control any storage. Further, as one of *Tang*'s alternative embodiments evidences an intent to store a data file before rasterization, *Tang* would not teach or suggest modifying frame memory 104 to control archival storage, as frame memory 104 only holds rasterized images.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 4 is patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 5, 6, 20, 23, 25 and 28 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5, 6, 20, 23, 25 and 28 are separately patentable over the applied references.

For example, regarding claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest that "the computer further includes a print instruction section for updating the print information of the print job and making print instructions," for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2.

Additionally, regarding claim 6, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest that "the archive stores a pair of PDL document and printer information and a pair of dot image and print information as the print job," for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 8.

Further, regarding claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied references, either alone or in any reasonable combination, teach or suggest that “the print information of the stored print job in the archive can be updated by the computer, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 22 and 24.

Withdrawn Independent Claim 12

Although independent claim 12 has been withdrawn from consideration, Applicants believe (see above traversal argument) that it should remain in consideration with respect to this Application. Thus, in an attempt to speed prosecution, Applicants respectfully submit that even a combination of *Kashiwazaki*, *Mitsuhashi* and *Tang* (which the Examiner has alleged discloses all the features of claim 1) fails to teach or suggest *at least* that “the computer further includes a print instruction section for updating the print information of the print job and making print instructions,” for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to dependent claim 2.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 12 is patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that withdrawn dependent claims 14-16 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claims 13 and 17

The Examiner has indicated that claims 13 and 17 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 3, allegedly “due to the similarities” between these claims.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that even a combination of *Kashiwazaki*, *Mitsuhashi* and *Tang* fails to teach or suggest *at least* storing “a pair of PDL document and printer information and a pair of dot image and print information as the print job,” for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 8.

Independent Claim 18

The Examiner has indicated that claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 3, allegedly “due to the similarities” between these claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that even a combination of *Kashiwazaki, Mitsuhashi* and *Tang* fails to teach or suggest *at least* that “the output control section also controls the storing of the dot image stored in the output work and the print information in the print archive as the print job,” for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 4.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 33-40 are hereby added, are fully supported *at least* by FIGS. 2, 6, 12 and 13 of the instant Application, and are respectfully submitted to be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-40 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1-40.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/518,099

Attorney Docket # Q58148

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy P. Cremen  
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
23373  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 19, 2004